

F99
H85

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 110 539 5

Hollinger
pH 8.5

F 99
.H85
Copy 1

R

DESPOTIC DOCTRINES

DECLARED BY THE

UNITED STATES SENATE,

EXPOSED;

AND

SENATOR DIXON UNMASKED.



HARTFORD:
PRESS OF CASE, LOCKWOOD & COMPANY.
1863.

F99

.H85

43007
01

Despotic Doctrines Declared by the United
States Senate, Exposed;

AND

SENATOR DIXON UNMASKED.

REPUBLICANS OF CONNECTICUT:

In accordance with my promise to many of you, I now present a statement of the action of the Senate upon my nomination for Collector of Internal Revenue for this district; of the connection of Senator Dixon therewith, and of his relations to the republican party. I have deferred its publication until the present time, that your attention might not be diverted from your duties in our late memorable State canvass.

I had hoped that the Senate would lift the veil from its proceedings by removing the injunction of secrecy, but it has not seen fit to do so. I am, however, able to present the material facts, from information collected from various reliable sources while I was in Washington.

If the matter concerned myself only, I should have been disinclined to press it upon the public attention. But the facts will show that Senator Dixon in prostituting his official trust for his own personal ends, has brought reproach upon our State—that he is hostile to the republican faith, and is conspiring to destroy its organization and power. And that in his efforts to prevent my confirmation, the Senate has been induced to announce principles subversive of the constitution, and abhorrent to every man who is not willing to renounce his freedom, and become a vassal.

The appointment was recommended to the President by our governor, lieutenant governor, the other state officers, speaker of the assembly with other members of the legislature, and by the leading business men of the district. And their recommendations were endorsed by Secretaries Chase and Welles. The President gave Mr. Dixon and his friends a full hearing upon the subject, and then, with a comprehensive knowledge of all the facts, including those relating to our local political relations, the President made the appointment. All appeared satisfied. And so well satisfied was the Secretary of the Treasury with the administration of the duties of the office that he earnestly urged senators to confirm the President's nomination.

HOW SENATOR DIXON PREVENTED CONFIRMATION.

Until Senator Dixon's first demonstration of hostility in the secret session of the Senate, it was not known by any one here that the President's nomination was to be opposed, except by the few in the confidence of the senator. But upon visiting Washington, and conversing with senators, the nominee found that Senator Dixon had been engaged almost entirely, for months, in making personal appeals to republican senators, political appeals to democratic and border-state senators, and aided by personal arrangements, social appliances, and gross misrepresentations, he had succeeded in binding a large portion of the senators to vote against my confirmation.

With the other means employed by Senator Dixon for the accomplishment of his purpose, he exhibited letters to senators as spontaneous expressions of public sentiment adverse to the confirmation of the nominee, which were written in response to *his own* letters, and upon *his own statements* against him.

BOGUS LETTER AND TELEGRAM.

Senator Howard of Michigan, having known me from my boyhood, it was deemed especially necessary to convince

TABLE III

CHORO TO

him that the appointment was an unpopular one. And after the first vote on the nomination, Mr. Dixon presented to him what purported to be a telegraphic dispatch from Hartford, saying that guns had been, or were then being fired there, over my rejection! He also exhibited to the same senator a letter purporting to come from the chairman of the Republican State Committee, the substance of which was an earnest request to Senator Dixon to defeat my confirmation!

That such a dispatch and such a letter were presented to Senator Howard, by Senator Dixon, *I have been repeatedly assured by Senator Howard himself.*

The following letter shows that no such guns were fired, nor was any such letter written by the chairman of the Republican State Committee :

HARTFORD, March 3, 1863.

MARK HOWARD, Esq.—*Dear Sir* : In answer to your inquiries, I will only say that I have never written Mr. Dixon, or any other senator or person whomsoever, urging or advising your rejection, nor have any guns been fired or any other public demonstration been made in this state on account of your rejection by the Senate.

J. G. BATTERSON,
Chairman State Central Committee.

For the sake of the character of our State, it is hoped that Senator Dixon will be able to satisfactorily explain these matters.*

How truthfully the senator represented the public sentiment of his own town in this case, may be judged by the fact, that the Republican Town Committee declined to permit him to preside at one of the large meetings in Hartford during the late state canvass, and on the ground, too, that the general feeling against him would not allow it. *His voice was not heard during the whole contest—anywhere.*—While the energies of every patriotic man and woman in the State, as well as those

* Since the first publication of these statements, Mr. Dixon has denied that he exhibited such letter and telegram to Senator Howard,—the only statements in the address which he has controverted, over his name. But as an investigation into his private explanations of this matter has not proved satisfactory, the statement is retained in this pamphlet.

that came to our aid from other States, were taxed to their utmost power to save the State, *Senator Dixon was silent!**

THE DOCTRINE OF SENATORIAL AUTOCRACY.

The thing which finally enabled Senator Dixon to succeed in defeating a confirmation of the President's nomination, was an appeal to *Senators' love of power*. It was urged that every senator should control the federal appointments in his own locality, and that his objection should be conclusive against a nominee. This suggestion to senators of the means for crushing out opposition to them at home, and of increasing and of perpetuating their own power, proved to be irresistible to a number who could not be influenced by other considerations,—and accordingly, with them, Senator Dixon's objection to me settled the matter,—without reference to the merits of the case. Leading senators informed me that it was this that prevented my confirmation.

If the Senate had embodied this principle in a resolution it would read as follows :

Resolved, By the Senate, that every senator shall have the right to control all the federal appointments in his own locality, and therefore his objection to a nominee shall be conclusive against such nominee, without reference to his merits.

Is not this a virtual annihilation of the constitutional rights of the President in respect to appointments requiring the action of the Senate? And are the American people prepared for this advance of senatorial despotism, to crush out popular liberty, and make a man's eligibility to office depend upon his servility to his senator? Thus is every senator constituted the *autocrat* of his own locality! And, under this principle, but few Republicans in Hartford would be deemed eligible for any appointment requiring the action of the Senate.*

THE DOCTRINE OF SENATORIAL INFALLIBILITY.

No charge was made from any source, that the nominee was wanting either in "honesty, capacity or fidelity"—Sena-

* The only paper in the State, (excepting the New Haven "*Register*," a bitter opposition sheet,) that defends Mr. Dixon's action in this case is his own organ, the Hartford "*Courant*"—one of the proprietors of which was an applicant for the office, and conspired with the senator to prevent the confirmation of the late collector.

tor Dixon was forced to admit that I possessed those qualifications—and was a zealous supporter of the government. But alleged that I was personally opposed to him, and for this he asked my rejection. His allegations to different persons as to the character of this opposition, were various—some of them were sad distortions of the truth, and some without any foundation in truth. *And he was unwilling to have the case and his own statements investigated.* That I might not have the usual hearing before the committee of the Senate to whom such nominations are referred, he told Senator Fessenden, when called upon, that he had no objections to present to it, and consequently the finance committee *unanimously* reported in favor of confirmation. But Senator Dixon only waited until he had an opportunity to assail me in secret session of the Senate, where he hoped to strike me down without my having any opportunity to defend myself. He did thus assail me, and carried a majority of the Senate against confirmation. But by the timely action of Senator Foster, the case was suspended on a motion to reconsider. And learning Senator Dixon's allegations, I sent in a written appeal to the Senate, through Senator Fessenden, to have the case recommitted to the finance committee, that it might be fully investigated, and all allegations, from whatever source, be inquired into. I also promised to demonstrate to the committee that the opposition had arisen from my active support of the government. I also asked to be personally examined. Senator Fessenden, chairman of the finance committee, urged the justice of granting this request, as my assailant had deprived me of a hearing before the committee, in the manner above stated. What, fellow citizens, do you think was the response to this appeal for common justice? It was, that to recommit for examination into the statements of a Senator would be an impeachment of his veracity, and hence, an assault upon the dignity of the Senate!

If this principle was announced in the form of a resolution it would read about as follows:

Resolved, by the Senate, that whatever allegations a Senator may make against any person not a member of this body, they can not be the subject of examination—as it would be an impeachment of the veracity of such Senator, and an assault upon the dignity of this body.

Thus are Senators virtually declared to be *infallible* by the Senate. And thus is inaugurated, in this country, the doctrine that “the king can do no wrong.” This places every man at the mercy of a Senator who can assail and crush him by false statements, and the victim can not expose their falsehood to the Senate, as any such attempt would be an assault upon the dignity of the Senate! Can any man submit to such a doctrine, unless he is willing to be a crouching slave?

THE POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF THE VOTE.

Senator Dixon, by his arrangements and appeals, succeeded in carrying against my confirmation all the “border state” and “democratic” senators, excepting Senator Rice. But such noble champions of republicanism as Fessenden, Sumner, Wilson, King, Wilmot, Wade, Howard, Chandler, Trumbull, Grimes, Wilkinson, with others (not certainly known), besides Senator Foster, voted for confirmation. And some of these Senators boldly and eloquently denounced the wrong done not only to the nominee, but to the character of the Senate itself, for the gratification of the private feelings of a senator. And Senator Foster, prompted by a sense of justice, eloquently denounced the injustice of the Senate, earnestly labored for my confirmation, and faithfully represented the views of our citizens, as expressed in their remonstrances* against my rejection. He did much towards redeeming the character of our state from the disgrace inflicted upon it by the conduct of his colleague.

Thus you have a history of the case, as far as the appointment and the action of the Senate are concerned.

*See appendix for remonstrance of tax payers.

HIS MOTIVES.

Senator Dixon had several motives in defeating my confirmation :

1st. To gratify his malignity, and weaken the influence of the nominee.

2d. To terrorize and break the spirit of the earnest republicans of the state.

3d. To create an impression that he was omnipotent at Washington, so far as the dispensation of federal patronage in this state is concerned, that he might bring to his feet all the office-holders, and all others desiring government favors, —to gratify his pride, and aid him in carrying out his hostile designs against republicanism.

4th. To secure the influence of the office for one of his own instruments.

In this attempt to control his fellow-citizens through their fears, the senator underestimated the manhood of his native state. None, however, need now be alarmed at his power. It has exhausted its force on me. The bad passions lurking beneath the oily surface of the wily and rotten politician have violently leaped forth, and exposed his real character. The Connecticut *Machiavel* is well understood, now, at Washington. With months of unscrupulous and secret effort, and by the prostitution of his official position, he succeeded in preventing my confirmation ; but he failed to secure the appointment of one of his instruments to the place.

HOW HE OBTAINED HIS RE-ELECTION TO THE SENATE.

It is a mystery to many both in and out of the state, how Mr. Dixon was returned to the Senate by the republican party, when he has manifested such a want of sympathy with its ideas and sentiments. This mystery is easily solved: Whilst the earnest and true men of the party have been busy inculcating its faith and in developing its power, he has been studying, solely, how to appropriate that power to his own aggrandizement. And by means of systematic deception, and the active and wily efforts of a few pensioned retainers, seat-

tered over the state, he has been enabled to circumvent the men of principle, seize our party machinery and by it force himself into his present position. The "Summer letter" (hereafter mentioned), and the "two term" plea, by which his friends claimed a person must be re-elected once to save him from disgrace, with the intimidation of Federal office holders, and a profusion of promises of favor to others, were among the potent means used in securing his re-election.

But if there had been timely and concerted action among those opposed to his re-election, he certainly could not have obtained it, notwithstanding the *extraordinary* means employed by him. The sentiment of the party was decidedly against him. Gov. Buckingham, the representative of the radical republicans of the state, had just been re-elected by over 9000 majority.

Here, in Hartford, the home of the Senator, where his real character and views are best known, he could not, for some time previous to his re-election, have obtained a majority of the republican votes *for any office*, however humble. I think no Hartford man will be bold enough to deny this. Our city and town nominations, as well as those for the legislature, were made *that year* upon the distinct issue of support or opposition to the Senator, and in *every instance*, his friends were voted down by a large majority, though personally unobjectionable.

HIS REAL POLITICAL CHARACTER.

It is well known that I have had a long and somewhat intimate intercourse with Mr. Dixon. And that for my friendly disposition towards him I suffered much reproach from leading republicans, who had ceased to repose confidence in him. But this intercourse finally produced upon my own mind the most painful and reluctant convictions. I was forced to the conclusion that his sympathies were not with his own section, but were with the Southern oligarchy. That he was really hostile to our beneficent political faith. That he hated republicanism for its humanity, and its self-sacrificing devotion to principle. That he had no faith in the political integrity of his fellow-men, but believed that "every

man had his price," and that the political independence of men depended upon their pecuniary circumstances—that his only interest in the republican party was in its power, which he desired to use solely for the gratification of his own pride and ambition, and *to defraud the sentiment of his state.*

These were not hasty conclusions, but were reached gradually and reluctantly.

These convictions obliged me to declare myself opposed to his re-election to the Senate. And this, in fact, is the chief cause of his hostility. *We have had no personal differences.* My differences with him have been purely political, not personal. And if he considers these personal, it is because his politics are personal. It has always appeared difficult for him to comprehend how a man's political action can be governed by an earnest and animating political faith.

His political character is one chosen by himself, and I only give its indications, that it may not be misunderstood :

HIS POLITICAL COURSE REVIEWED.

Read his speech of December, 1860, raving at the people of Connecticut for not humbling themselves to the Southern aristocracy, and submitting to its arrogant demands. Though worded cautiously, that is its true meaning. All recollect the exultant shouts of our enemies over it throughout the land. I earnestly labored to have him repair the injurious effect of this speech, but in vain. His affiliation and sympathy with Slidell, Clay of Alabama, Thompson of Mississippi, and other leaders of the rebellion, while they were in Washington, is notorious there. It was however necessary for him to vote with the republicans in the Senate, occasionally, to retain his power at home, in view of a re-election. And now, also, to secure some of the patronage of the administration, with which to pay his retainers.

THE BLAIR LETTER.

A little more than one year ago the loyal citizens of Hartford filled our city hall, at the call of our republican town committee, to remonstrate against the support given by the

administration to the Hartford *Times*. The meeting declared *unanimously* "that it was the most disloyal paper in New England." It also denounced, *by a large majority*, the disloyal conduct of the *postmaster*, in persistently sustaining that establishment, and for insolently defying the loyal sentiment of the town. It appealed to Senator Dixon to vindicate the cause of loyalty by procuring the withdrawal of the government patronage from that paper, and the removal of the postmaster. A committee was also appointed, of our leading citizens, to urge such action upon him, which it did. In response to this patriotic appeal, Senator Dixon sent to our papers for publication, *on the eve of our state election*, a letter signed by P. M. General Blair, and *addressed to him*, rebuking the meeting, and indorsing the *Times* and the democratic leaders of this state, in the following language :

"Since the rebellion broke out there has been no division of sentiment between old parties on the question of maintaining the Union ; and that the Hartford *Times*, and the leaders of the democratic organization generally, sustain the administration *as unfalteringly* in its determination to maintain the Union as the leaders of the republican organization"!!

It is believed that Senator Dixon inspired this letter, if he did not write it. Its sentiments are almost identical with those expressed by him to the committee of our citizens. His relations with the postmaster-general, were commanding, being a member of the post office committee of the senate. No one acquainted with these relations can doubt that he could have accomplished all that the loyal citizens of his town had asked. At any rate, he could have prevented the appearance of this letter if he had so desired, by pointing out to the postmaster-general its gross errors, and inducing him to withdraw it. But he hurried it forward for publication, and it first appeared in his own organ here, (*Courant*), with an *approving* introduction ! And thus was a most powerful weapon placed in the hands of the enemies of the administration *to strike down its friends* !

Later developments plainly indicate the Senator's hostility to our cause. In his private conversations, his words have

little cheer but for the enemies of the Government. He expresses his doubts of its ability to suppress the rebellion; he complains of the confiscation act; stigmatizes Republicans as "Abolitionists;" charges to them the troubles of the country, and he appears more anxious to have the "radicals" put down than the rebels, or their supporters in our midst. And McClellan is glorified by him long after he is superseded, if not even now.

How can any one reconcile such conduct with fidelity to the Government, and to the party which chiefly sustains it?

On the eve of our late canvass, with such fearful issues before us, when every effort was necessary to maintain Federal authority in our State, and secure public order, Senator Dixon saw fit to throw into our ranks another bomb-shell well calculated to produce disaster, in using the influence of his official position to strike down a fellow-citizen, acknowledged by him to be a zealous supporter of the Government, and this, too, solely for the gratification of his personal feelings and views. Earnest friends of our cause appealed to him to desist for its sake, but in vain. He exhibited neither anxiety for our cause, nor a conciliatory spirit towards me.

In palliation of the Senator's conduct in this case, his friends represent that I provoked this assault by repelling his conciliatory propositions. *He made no such advances to me, in any form, or through any channel.* Nor has he ever informed me that he had been personally aggrieved by me. We last separated as personal friends, as I supposed—nearly a year ago—since which we have had no personal intercourse.

The Senator himself appeals to a sentiment of *revenge*, for justification in this matter, in alleging, as he does industriously, that I "defied" his power. But this statement, like the preceding one, is an invention to shield him from the consequences of his act.

But what doctrine do these pretexts shamelessly proclaim? Is it not that a person has the right to use a public trust for private purposes?

HOW HE OBTAINED THE SUMNER ENDORSEMENT.

I am aware that just preceding his re-election he sustained some of the "radical" measures before the Senate. And I am likewise aware, that in consequence of this, Charles Sumner was induced to give a letter, saying that he thought the "cause of freedom" required Mr. Dixon's re-election. And this letter was effectively used in securing his re-election. But the "cause of freedom" and Mr. Dixon have known but little of each other since that event.

And as if to relieve himself of the taint of Republicanism from this contact with Mr. Sumner, and his re-election by a Republican Legislature, he hastened, after his re-election, to introduce into the Senate a set of resolutions the opposite in principle to those pending in the Senate introduced by Mr. Sumner himself. These resolutions, though cunningly worded, were felt at Washington to be hostile in spirit to the Administration. They were exultingly copied by the Hartford *Times* and that class of papers generally, and gave much aid and comfort to the enemies of the Government.

HIS WEAKENING INFLUENCE ON THE PARTY.

Senator Dixon has contributed nothing to the strength of the Republican party in Connecticut, though he has seized its highest honors. And I appeal, with confidence, to the judgment of every reflecting Republican in the State, if his influence upon the party has not been, constantly, baneful and *depressing*, instead of stimulating and encouraging. His doubtful position on vital questions before the Senate has alarmed the whole country, and subjected you to reproach and humiliation for having such a questionable representative. Having no confidence in any but the baser motives of men, these only has he appealed to for the accomplishment of his schemes at home, and in this way he has degraded the political morals of our State, and prevented his votaries from having a just comprehension of the nobler spirit and higher purposes of our party. This is one of the principal causes of the poor progress of Republicanism in this State, and a reason

why we have had to struggle from year to year, at such an immense expenditure of labor and means, to save the State.

Massachusetts, lying by our side, has a Senator Wilson—a true representative in all places of her humanity, her faith, her courage and her manhood—her genuine Republicanism. His heart is in the cause, and his influence ever elevating and inspiring. She maintains her Republican ascendancy with but little effort.

Connecticut has a Senator Dixon whose whole influence is exerted to degrade her sentiment and crush out her vital Republicanism—her animating spirit. And our ascendancy in the State is maintained only by exhausting struggles and the palpably bad cause of our opponents. Preceding each of *our last three State elections*, he has struck such a blow at the party as was calculated to distract and defeat it—first, his Dec. '60 speech; the next year, the "Blair letter," which he threw into the canvass, and this year, the act discussed in this address. No open enemy in the State has inflicted so much injury upon the cause of Republicanism and loyalty.

HIS FUTURE DESIGNS—THURLOW WEED PLOT.

The rebels occasionally use our National flag to more effectually strike down its brave defenders. And for a similar purpose Senator Dixon may, for the present, continue to use our noble Republican banner, especially as we have again carried the State. But be no longer deceived, Republicans, for he is *instinctively* and *bitterly* hostile to your generous and inspiring faith, and is aiming, stealthily, at the destruction of your organization. Leading Republicans in Washington assured me it was their firm conviction that he was in the "Thurlow Weed combination" to destroy the Republican party and form a new organization, upon the basis of a compromise with the rebels. Those engaged in this plot are generally known as "conservatives." I promised our friends there to warn you of this plot, and do now earnestly warn you!

CONCLUSION.

The act of the Senate proclaiming that a citizen's *first fealty is due to his Senator instead of his Government*, and also that a Senator from his position is infallible, and therefore his statements against a citizen must not be questioned, because it would be an assault upon the dignity of the Senate, and the fact that such doctrines were used to make the Senate the instrument of the personal malice and private views of a Senator, is a sad part of the history of the country. And every man who respects the Constitution of his country, and desires to preserve his own rights, must resist such a flagrant attempt to overthrow his liberty and convert him into a vassal.

But if the future welfare of the organization upon which the Government now mainly depends for its support would permit it, and the historian could overlook the humiliating fact, that in the midst of the severest struggle of the nation for its life, and civil war threatening even his own State, Connecticut had one Senator so indifferent to the perils of his country, that he employed his time and his official influence, nearly an entire session of Congress, to the persecution of one of his fellow-citizens, for being more devoted to the Government than to him, I would, for the honor of our State, have cheerfully drawn a thick veil over the political character and acts of SENATOR DIXON.

MARK HOWARD.

Hartford, April, 1863.

APPENDIX.

REMONSTRANCE PRESENTED TO THE SENATE BY HON.
L. S. FOSTER.

To the Honorable Lafayette S. Foster, and other Senators of the United States :

GENTLEMEN: We have heard with surprise and regret that objection is made to the appointment of Mark Howard, Esq., who has been nominated by the President for Collector of Internal Revenue in this District. From a long and thorough acquaintance with Mr. Howard, we are confident such opposition can not rest upon any valid grounds, and we trust it will not be successful.

His high reputation for financial ability, moral integrity, and patriotic devotion rendered the nomination of Mr. Howard highly acceptable to the Republican party in Connecticut; and the admirable manner in which he has performed the duties of the office, delicate and difficult as they were, at the commencement, has gained for him the confidence and good will of the tax-payers, and secured the marked approbation of the head of the Department at Washington.

In our opinion, the failure to confirm his nomination would be a serious injury to the public interests, and a severe blow to the friends of the Union in this State. No man has been more faithful in the support of our National and State administrations during these times that "try men's souls" than Mark Howard. And now, on the eve of our State election, if he is struck down, the effect will be discouraging, perhaps disastrous. Not that it will affect his political action; he is not the man to suffer private griefs or private piques to swerve him from the path of duty; but many who know his moral worth, his noble patriotism, and his efficient labors, if they see him sacrificed will feel that our cause is weakened, and the right has suffered. We can not

afford to be thus weakened, and we earnestly and respectfully invoke your aid to prevent it.

Wm. W. Ellsworth, - - -	[Ex. Gov.]
H. A. Perkins, - - -	[Pres't Hartford Bank.]
H. K. W. Welch, - - -	[State Senator.]
John L. Bunce, - - -	[Pres't Phoenix Bank.]
Thomas Belknap, - - -	[Pres't State Bank.]
James Goodwin, - - -	[Pres't Conn. Mutual Life Ins. Co.]
C. H. Brainard, - - -	[Wholesale Merchant, &c.]
T. C. Perkins, - - -	[Attorney.]
Chas. E. Perkins, - - -	[Pres't City Council.]
J. L. Strong, - - -	[Attorney.]
Alfred Smith, - - -	[Ex. Pres't Conn. River Bank-]
A. G. Hammond, - - -	[Pres't Exchange Bank.]
Albert Day, - - -	[Ex. Lient. Gov.—Day, Griswold & Co.]
James G. Bolles, - - -	[Present U. S. Collector.]
Calvin Day, - - -	[Day, Owen & Co.]
Lucius Barbour, - - -	[Wholesale Merchant.]
O. G. Terry, - - -	[Pres't Ætna Bank.]
Geo. M. Bartholomew, - - -	[Pres't Hartford County Bank.]
J. A. Butler, - - -	[Pres't Conn. River Bank.]
E. N. Kellogg & Co., - - -	[Merchants and Manufacturers.]
John C. Tracy, - - -	[Pres't Farmer's and Mechanic's Bank.]
Austin Dunham & Co., - - -	[Merchants and Manufacturers.]
Hillyer & Bunce, - - -	[Wholesale Merchants.]
J. F. Judd & Co., - - -	[Wholesale Merchants.]
Ives, Blanchard & Co., - - -	[Wholesale Merchants.]
Collins Bros. & Co., - - -	[Wholesale Merchants.]
Thomas T. Fisher, - - -	[Merchant and Manufacturer.]
Chas. D. Warner, - - -	[Editor of "Press."]
E. Flower & Co., - - -	[Merchants.]
Cheney Bros., - - -	[Silk Manufacturers.]
Olcott Allen, - - -	[Treas'r Soc. Savings.]
G. F. Davis, - - -	[Pres't City Bank.]
S. L. Loomis, - - -	[Pres't Phoenix Ins. Co.]
James B. Hosmer, - - -	[Pres't Soc. Savings.]
Case, Lockwood & Co., - - -	[Printers.]
T. M. Allyn, - - -	[Pres't Hartford Carpet Co.]
C. T. Hillyer, - - -	[Pres't Charter Oak Bank.]
Owen, Day & Root, - - -	[Wholesale Merchants.]

HARTFORD, Feb. 18, 1863.

[Senator Foster stated to the Senate, from his own knowledge of the signers of the above remonstrance, and from examination, that they represented between \$20,000,000 and \$30,000,000 of property.]

In addition to this remonstrance, numerous letters were sent to senators by the leading tax-payers of the district, urging the confirmation of the nominee, and protesting against the course of Senator Dixon.

COMMENTS OF THE PRESS.

From the Hartford Press, Feb. 20.

The community learn with great astonishment that Senator Dixon has succeeded in preventing the confirmation of Mark Howard, Esq., collector of this district, in the Senate. We forbear comment for the present, hoping that the Republican Senators will reconsider their action at this critical time in our State politics. We can not understand how the Senate has been induced to strike down one of the truest friends of the government in this State, without some gross deception has been used.

From the N. Y. Tribune, Feb. 23.

MR. MARK HOWARD, who was nominated for Collector of Internal Revenue for the Hartford District, Conn., has been rejected in the Senate. Reason: of the two classes of Republicans—those who became such because their understandings and hearts accepted the principles of the party, and those who reluctantly joined the party because they had nowhere else to go—he belongs to the former. Nobody dare risk a doubt of his capacity or his integrity; but he was a Republican from the start, while others clung to the Whig party till after it was dead, and then took refuge in Know Nothingism till it, too, dissolved, and then made their way reluctantly and sullenly to the Republican life-boat; and these are now “*conservative*,” and can’t abide those who were Republicans when they might have been something else. By the influence of these, aided by the vote of every Senator who frankly hates the Republican cause and name, Mr. Howard has been rejected. Happily, he had lived usefully and honorably a good many years before he received this, his first political office; and he will continue so to live, and to pay his debts at the rate of one hundred cents on the dollar, if he never gets another. If the office can do without him as well as he can without the office, there need be no tears shed. Yet it is aggravating that men who are Republicans on compulsion, should be able, under Republican rule, to exclude from office good men who are Republicans by free choice.

WHAT THEY THINK ABROAD.

The appointment of Mark Howard, as collector under the federal law for the Hartford district, has been rejected by the Senate, at the instance of Senator Dixon. This is extraordinary and outrageous. Mr. Howard is one of the most worthy of men—an earnest Republican and a capable and honest officer. Only pure personal matters could have led Mr. Dixon to get him rejected.—*Springfield Rep.*

The intention of this action of Senator Dixon on the eve of our election is too evident. We shall not gratify him by agitating the matter at present.—*Press, Feb. 21.*

From the Hartford Post, Feb. 28.

The telegraph says that the Senate wasted three hours, Thursday, in a fight over the nomination of two collectors, one of them, Mark Howard, of this city, being opposed by Senator Dixon. This opposition to Mr. Howard is foolish and contemptible. It is a part of the scheme to divide the sentiment of the friends of the government in Connecticut, which has been concocted in the *Courant* office by a gang of two-penny politicians, who hive there, and of which James Dixon is the head and A. N. Clark the tail. It is a part of the working of this high-minded tribe, who oppose Mr. Howard, and are not altogether friendly to Gov. Buckingham because the Governor and Mr. Howard are fast friends. Believe us, if Mr. Dixon would pay half the attentions to the wants of his country that he does to the wants of his office-seeking friends, he would do himself honor and achieve everlasting fame. Let him be a patriot instead of a politician. All of which is respectfully submitted.

From the New York Tribune.

NOMINATIONS AND REJECTIONS.

The recent contest in the Senate over the nomination of Mark Howard as collector of internal revenue in the Hartford district, Conn., involves principles and consequences so grave that they ought not to elude popular attention. We shall endeavor fairly and fully to indicate them.

James Dixon and Mark Howard are both residents of Hartford, and both act with the republican party. Mr. Howard was one of the founders of the party, and has ever been a thorough, enthusiastic,

hard-working champion of its principles. Mr. Dixon became a republican when there was no longer any "whig" or "American" party remaining, and when there was no remaining choice but between the "republican," and the "democratic" parties. Of course, he is now a "conservative" republican, and regards Mr. Howard as "radical." Of course, he has held the best office in the gift of the republicans of Connecticut ever since they had any to give; and of course Mr. Howard never held any at all till last fall, when the President made him collector of internal revenue as aforesaid. We do not complain of this disparity—it is the way things usually go. Both senator and collector are good citizens, responsible and capable business men, and blameless in all their private and social relations. Their only difference is one of principle; and this led Mr. Howard to oppose Mr. Dixon's election (or a reelection) as Senator. In return, Mr. Dixon—in opposition to his colleague, to the great mass of republicans of Hartford, and especially to the property and intelligence of that city, has—by enlisting the congenial support of the anti-republican senators—secured Mr. Howard's rejection as collector.

The secretary of the treasury, who knows how thoroughly and admirable has been Mr. Howard's performance of his official duties, ardently desires his confirmation. So did the secretary of navy, who, when at home, is the neighbor and friend of both Messrs. Dixon and Howard. Senator Foster presented a petition from Hartford for that confirmation signed by only thirty-eight names, which he stated, represented property to the amount of twenty millions of dollars. The finance committee of the senate unanimously recommended that confirmation. Yet it was defeated, solely because Mr. Howard was a radical republican, and was not a supporter of the personal fortunes of Senator Dixon. No republican voted to reject him for any other reason. It was assumed that a senator's will should be omnipotent with regard to appointments in his own locality, and that whoever he opposed he should be rejected. We should not like to see nominees in Senators Powell, Wall, Turpie, Richardson, and Carlile's localities respectively submitted to that test. And we hold that a senator has no right to oppose a nomination on grounds essentially personal to himself. If the nominee is unworthy, reject him; but not merely because he is of another school or *stratum* of the party from your own.

No opposition having been made to Mr. Howard's confirmation till it came up for final action in the senate, his friends were taken by surprise by the allegations of personal antipathy and active hostility made by Mr. Dixon, and asked a recommitment to afford opportunity

for rebutting testimony. This was twisted into an impeachment of the veracity of a senator, and on that ground refused. We deem that a most unwarranted stretch of prerogative where the rights and interests of an absent citizen are at stake.

We hear that a motion has been made to remove the injunction of secrecy from the proceedings in this case, and we trust it may prevail.

From the Hartford Press, March 4.

MARK HOWARD.

It will be seen by his card, given elsewhere, that the official duties of our excellent collector, Mark Howard, Esq., terminate to-day. And we are sure the announcement will be read with regret by all who have had business relations with him. It will not be possible for his successor to transact the business of his office with more promptness, fidelity to the government and courtesy to the tax-payers. He leaves his business in admirable order. Every cent of the taxes laid for September, October, November and December has been collected; and all the tax for January would have been paid at this date if the collector had not been interrupted. And there has not been a distraint made, nor a single harsh measure used.

Neither the government nor this district can afford to lose the services of such a man. But his rejection by the Senate does not impair his standing in this community; the manner in which it was accomplished brings no disgrace upon *him*. In rejecting him the Senate were governed by the most outrageous principle, that a man's fitness for the office has nothing to do with his confirmation; the enmity of a single senator outweighs all that. And the President is openly insulted. His every appointment must be dictated by some member of the Senate. It has heretofore been supposed that the President made the appointments, and the Senate confirmed them, unless there was something in the business or moral character of the nominee which unfitted him for the appointment. The people may well be alarmed at this despotism for personal injury, which the Senate bands itself together to practice.

From the Boston Congregationist, March 6.

PERSONAL.

If the papers report Senator Dixon of Conn. correctly, he has done a very small thing, and a very mean thing, in securing the defeat in the Senate, of the nomination of Mr. Mark Howard of Hartford, as

Collector of Internal Revenue for the District of Hartford. Mr. Howard has held the office some months, and has performed its duties admirably, but because he was a radical Republican, and personally distasteful to Senator Dixon, the latter secured his defeat.

From the New York Independent, March 12.

POLITICAL.

Mark Howard, Esq., an energetic Republican on uncompromising principle, was nominated for the Collectorship of Hartford district in Conn., and was rejected in the Senate, avowedly by the personal efforts of Senator Dixon of that state, a personal enemy. This affair, trifling in itself, excites considerable attention as a bold manifestation of a most dangerous political practice. It is as much as to say that the people shall lose the services of valuable public officers whenever a revengeful trading politician chooses to punish them.

From the Springfield Republican, April 17.

Mark Howard, rejected as federal collector of taxes at Hartford by Senator Dixon's influence, has published a history of the case, and a review of the senator's political career and position. It is quite effective and damaging, both against Mr. Dixon and the majority of the Senate.

From the Democrat, (St. Louis,) April 17th.

FEDERAL APPOINTMENTS.

The case of Mark Howard, of Hartford, Connecticut, elicited considerable remark a few weeks ago, from the eastern press. The interest of the case is likely to be renewed, and from what we understand from remarks in Hartford journals there will be an attempt, since the election in the state of Connecticut, to repair the wrong done in the matter. The facts are these. Mark Howard was appointed Collector of Internal Revenue in the Hartford, Conn., District, but his nomination was rejected by the senate, at the special instance of Senator Dixon, of Connecticut, on purely political grounds. What these grounds were can easily be inferred from the following paragraph taken from the *New York Tribune*:

"James Dixon and Mark Howard are both residents of Hartford, and both act with the Republican party. Mr. Howard was one of the founders of the party, and has ever been a thorough, enthusiastic, hard-working champion of its principles. Mr. Dixon became a Republican when there was no longer any 'Whig' or 'American' party remaining, and when there was no remaining choice but between the

'Republican' and the 'Democratic' parties. Of course he is now a 'conservative' Republican, and regards Mr. Howard as 'radical.' Of course he has held the best office in the gift of the Republicans of Connecticut ever since they had any to give; and of course Mr. Howard never held any at all till last Fall, when the president made him Collector of Internal Revenue, as aforesaid. We do not complain of this disparity—it is the way things usually go. Both senator and collector are good citizens, responsible and capable business men, and blameless in all their private and social relations. Their only difference is one of principle."

The sin of which Mr. Howard was guilty, and which occasioned his rejection for office, was *radicalism*. That this is regarded as no very heinous offense by the people of Connecticut, appears from the result of the recent election in that state; and that it is looked upon in a similar light by the people in a good many other localities—St. Louis included—is made very apparent in the same manner. Since the exhibition made of their strength by the Radicals of Connecticut in the splendid victory they have recently achieved over the Copper-heads in that state, it would seem that they begin to entertain the determination that their opinions shall no longer be held cause of disqualification for official preferment, and in this we hope they will persevere.

Precisely the same principle is involved in the case of the federal appointments in this city and state. The appointees to civil position by the government are nearly all conservatives, while a very decided majority of the loyal people who support the government and the administration of President Lincoln are Radicals, as was conclusively shown in the last two elections. The office-holders in St. Louis represent a party, which to-day scarcely musters a corporal's guard of supporters outside of their own number. Yet, notwithstanding their utter want of popular strength, these conservative gentlemen exhibit the same narrow and despicable proscriptive spirit which was so glaringly exhibited by Senator Dixon in the case of Mark Howard. * *

From the New York Independent, April 23d.

MARK HOWARD, Esq., a thoroughly and vigorously war Republican, was nominated as collector of the Hartford (Conn.) district. He was rejected by the senate, not because he was unfit for the place, but in consequence of the personal enmity of Senator Dixon, of Connecticut, who thus deliberately gratifies private malice at the expense of public good. Mr. Howard has printed a circumstantial account of this singular affair, which the culpable senator does not yet venture to deny. Let it be remembered that this matter is significant, not on account of Mr. Howard, but because it shows how dangerously an un-

principled politician in office can attack the very basis of our frame of government. Such machinations as these of Dixon's are every whit as bad as Floyd's and Toucey's were, though in a different way.

From the Galena (Illinois) Daily Advertiser, April 21st.

MARK HOWARD.

The case of our friend, Mark Howard, at Hartford, Conn., continues to excite attention and discussion. It should do so, for things of that kind should not be permitted to occur without a good reason can be given for their so happening. Mr. Howard was one of the founders of the Republican party in Connecticut, a man of fine business capacity, of good habits and unquestioned character as a man. He is an earnest and far-sighted politician, who from the commencement of our national difficulties weighed their magnitude and had the courage to grapple with them unflinchingly. *Because of this*, Mark Howard's nomination for Collector of Internal Revenue in the Hartford District was rejected by the senate! This rejection was brought about through the influence of James Dixon, one of the Connecticut United States senators, who calls Mr. Howard a "radical," because he is in favor of defending the country by all the means that God has given, from the infamous assassins who are clutching at its throat. Mr. Dixon and all like him must learn before they are many years older, that this war is not to be ended, nor is the country to be most benefited by this course. A man's zeal for his country must not be effectually used against him to debar him from honorable distinction—used by the representatives of the states which that out-spoken zeal alone can save to the Union.

From the Detroit Advertiser and Tribune, April 23d.

JANUS-FACEDNESS.

Mark Howard, Esq., of Hartford, is a gentleman very well known in this section of the country, the earlier part of his life having been spent in this vicinity, and is at present a very prominent citizen of Connecticut. He is one of the original Republicans in that state, and has ever been a radical and uncompromising adherent of Republican principles. James Dixon, at present senator from the same state, is a politician, more selfish than honest, formerly a fogy conservative, latterly a moderate Republican, because that was the winning side, and in no way a fit exponent of Republican principles. Mr. Howard refused to aid the efforts of Mr. Dixon to obtain a re-election to the senate, on account of his political unfitness, and thereby secured that

gentleman's enmity. Mr. Howard's valuable services secured his nomination as Collector of his district under the Internal Revenue Law. Mr. Dixon defeated his confirmation in the senate on the ground that each senator should control the nominations in his own section, and by pledging senators who were unacquainted with Mr. Howard or the circumstances of the case, and against the strenuous efforts of Senator Foster, of the same state. No one has ever attempted to deny Mr. Howard's entire fitness for the place, and the only motive for his rejection was the personal hatred of Senator Dixon. Democratic senators aided largely in producing this result, and in throwing over a sterling republican to gratify a Janus-faced politician. We are glad for the honor of our senate that such contemptible exhibitions of mean spite are rare.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 110 539 5

